



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 650
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,648	11/29/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-299	3215
38516	7590	09/08/2005	EXAMINER	
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC PO BOX 3822 CARY, NC 27519			ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/995,648

Applicant(s)

KIRKPATRICK ET AL

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on June 17, 2005. Claims 1-35 were originally received for consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 1-14, 16-30 are amended, and claims 31-35 are cancelled. Claims 1-30 are currently being considered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on June 17, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding amended independent claim 1, the applicant argues that the CPA, Croy (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0037361), does not disclose "at least three hierarchically organized views" with "each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods." These arguments are not found persuasive. The CPA discloses that "there can be seen five separate file tabs which correspond to different types which correspond to different types of views the operator can have" (page 4, column 1, paragraph 45). These tabs include an XML, a Field tab, and an HTML tab, and it shows an operator which fields will need to have values defined in order to execute their desired action (page 4, column 2, paragraph 45). Each of these views, has a list of

Art Unit: 2131

validation types that it must satisfy, including "Alpha, Numeric, email, True-False, Static, ETC (unchecked), Date, Month, Weekday, and Zip Code types" (page 5, column 1, paragraph 50). Therefore, on the basis of the above disclosure, it is believed that the CPA does teach "at least three hierarchically organized views" with "each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods." Regarding amended dependent claims 3,5, and 6, the applicant argues the CPA does not teach, "data to be validated is sorted according to a highest priority view" and "if the data to be validated does not contain an entry matching the highest priority view, then the data is sorted according to a second-highest priority view" and "if the data to be validated does not contain an entry matching the second-highest priority view, then the data is sorted according to generic validation functions." Prior to amendment of the claims, claims 3,5, and 6 were concerned with "calling a plurality of Java servlet methods." Due to this change in scope, a new motivation for obviousness is formulated pertaining to these claims as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1,2,9,11,12,13,15,19,22,23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Croy (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0037361A1).

Regarding claim 1, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system for use with web-based applications comprising:

“a computer system running one or more web browsers capable of processing web forms” (page 3: paragraphs 35-37);

“a web server capable of processing Java code and web-based forms”
(page 2: paragraph 31, pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44);

“a storage mechanism coupled to said computer system, wherein said web server is used for validating data with information compiled from said storage mechanism” (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44); and

“validation rules stored in said storage mechanism, the validation rules comprising at least three hierarchically organized views with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods” (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-45).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein ***“said validation rules are organized as a table-based system”*** (page 4: column 44,48).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 7. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 7, wherein "**said validation rules are represented in the form of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol**" (page 4: paragraph 44).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 3. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 3, wherein "**said storage schema is represented by Lightweight Directory Access Protocol and includes three hierarchically organized views**" (page 4: paragraphs 44, 48).

Regarding claim 12, Croy discloses:

A web server system comprising:

"at least one web application" (page 3: paragraphs 35-37) ;

"means for performing validation service on data submitted by said at least one web application" (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44);

"means for processing web forms" (page 3: paragraphs 35-37);

"means for storing and retrieving a plurality of validation rules for performing said validation service, the validation rules comprising at least three hierarchically organized views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods" (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-45); and

"means for compiling validation rules into said at least one web application in order to perform said validation service" (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44).

Art Unit: 2131

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein "***the validation rules are organized as a table-based system***" (page 4: column 44,48).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein "***said validation rules are stored in a schema in the form of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol***" (page 4: paragraph 44).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 15. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A web server system according to claim 15, wherein "***said storage schema represented by Lightweight Directory Access Protocol represents validation functions stored as hierarchically-organized views that are dynamically updateable by an external administrator***" (page 2: paragraph 32, page 4: paragraphs 44, 48).

Regarding claim 22, Croy discloses:

A computer-readable medium with instructions executable by a processor for providing a validation application service for web-based applications, the medium comprising instructions to:

“couple a service request from a data device to a web server, the request including data to be validated” (page 4: paragraphs 40-44);

“generate a service session instruction, the service session instruction based at least in part on the service request” (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44);

“send the service session instruction to one or more web servers, the service session instruction corresponding to one or more data validation requests from said customer data device” (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44);

“compile at least one page based on stored validation rules in a database, the validation rules comprising at least three hierarchically organized views with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods” (page 3: paragraphs 40-41, page 4: paragraph 45-46); and

“send a validation service response to the data device, wherein the validation service response is based on the service request” (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44).

Regarding claim 23. Croy discloses:

A method of providing validation data service with a web-based computer system comprising the steps of:

"calling at least one Java server page from a web application" (page 3: paragraphs 40-41, page 4: paragraph 46);

"compiling said at least one Java server page at a web server" (page 3: paragraphs 40-41, page 4: paragraph 46);

"retrieving validation rules from a centralized storage mass coupled to said web server, the validation rules comprising at least three hierarchically organized views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods" (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-45);

"validating data from said web application in accordance with said validation rules" (pages 3-4: paragraphs 40-44).

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A method according to claim 23, further wherein ***"the validation rules are organized as a table-based system"*** (page 4: column 44,48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-8,10,14,16-18,20,21,and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croy (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0037361A1).

Claims 3,5,6 and 10, are rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Croy does not explicitly disclose a method for prioritizing the validation functions based on a highest, second highest, and a generic validation function as disclosed in claims 3,5,6 and 10. However, it is believed the limitations of claims 3,5,6 and 10 are obvious in light of the disclosure of Croy. Croy discloses that there are different validation types of alpha, numeric, email, True-false, static, date, month, weekday, and zip code (page 5, column 1, paragraph 50). It is well-known in that art that each validation rule is not executed simultaneously with another validation rule, but based on the order (prioritized) on which they appear in the validation rules database (Figure 2, item 202). In the disclosure of Croy, it is noted that different forms will have different required values (page 4, column 2, paragraph 45), so it is obvious that in many cases, most of the validation rules (alpha, numeric, zip code, etc.) will not be present in the web form, which is being validated. Therefore, based on the order in which the rules appear in the database (priority) the form is validated from highest, to second highest, to third-highest, and so on. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use a tiered approach to using each validation function because it is well-known in the art that functions are not executed simultaneously but in a pecking order defined by a rules database or access list.

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 3. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 3, wherein "***the highest priority view contains data describing a name of the highest priority view and an application name, the application name differentiating field names from those in other application***" (Figure 8, item 801), wherein there are a number of different views (HTML, XML, Field), and each view has its own field values which are subject to validation functions. Based on the reasoning given above, it would have been obvious to have the application name as the first step in validation (highest priority) as it the highest level form of identification on the form.

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 5, wherein "***the validation rules check for a name of the second-highest priority view that matches a name of the highest priority view***" (Figure 8, 801), wherein by the reasoning above in rejecting claim 5, the second highest priority validation rules follows the highest validation rule, which are both contained in the same view (HTML, XML, Field), wherein the different fields, require different values in each field depending on the type of form, and which the application name would be the same for the different validation functions since the validation functions are being performed on the same form.

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Croy discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 5, wherein "***the second-highest priority view contains data describing a generic string that is used to match a name of the highest priority view to a defined character***" (Figure 8, page 5, column 1, paragraph 50), wherein each field has to have a particular value in each required field as defined by the validation rules.

5. Claims 16-18, and 20-21 are dependent claims concerning a web server system analogous to the client-server computer system claims 3-8, and 10 rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.

6. Claims 25-30 are method claims analogous to the system claims 3-8, and 10 rejected above, and therefore, are rejected following the same reasoning.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 703-305-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
09/01/05


Primary Examiner
AU 2131
9/2/05